

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/708,072	GINDER ET AL.
	Examiner Marianne L. Padgett	Art Unit 1762

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) Marianne L. Padgett.

(3) _____

(2) James Proscia.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 March 2007

Time: Morning

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

12 & 16-18

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



**MARIANNE PADGETT
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Discussed independent claim 12, which still contained the option of nonmagnetic binders or matrix materials, which both Mr. Proscia & the examiner thought had been removed from the claims previously, but had been missed by both of them. It was agreed that "nonmagnetic" would be deleted from claim 12 & replaced by --copper--, which was disclosed in [0050] & in original claim 17, but also like the soft magnetic binders/matrixes differentiates from previously applied prior art spraying processes, which used polymeric binders. It was also agreed to delete claim 17 & amend claims 16 & 18 to positively claim the soft magnetic matrices.

The possibility of generically claiming metal, instead of only copper, was also discussed, however the closest support therefore in paragraph [0050], which referred to "weakly electrically conductive binders" did not necessarily specify metals, as there are electrically conductive polymers or doped polymers that could fit that description, and there was not any generically disclosed metal binder. It was also noted that "weakly" was a relative term that was not desirable in the claims.

MLP/Dictation software

3/13/2007

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/708,072	GINDER ET AL.	

All Participants:

Status of Application: After final

(1) Marianne L. Padgett.

(3) _____.

(2) James Proscia.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 March 2007

Time: 2:45 p.m.

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NA

Claims discussed:

Claim listing submitted 2/8/2007.

Prior art documents discussed:

NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



MARIANNE PADGETT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The listing of claims submitted 2/8/2007 fails to include any of the previous amendments to the claims, shows no current amendments, & appears to return the claims to the original claims as filed. Entry of this after final "amendment" is denied.

As the remarks submitted on 2/8/2007 do not indicate any amendments made to the claims, nor is there any reason to amend the claims apparent from review of the final rejection mailed 11/3/2006, and since submission of the 4 terminal disclaimers (approved) on 2/8/2007 has removed all outstanding rejections & objections, nonentry of this "amendment" does not affect the allowability of the claims as submitted 8/23/2006.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. J. P." or a similar variation.